

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action<sup>1</sup>, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 13, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,946,658 to Miyazawa et al. (“Miyazawa”) in view of Garner et al., “A Theory of Word Frequencies and Its Application to Dialogue Move Recognition” (“Garner”); rejected claims 3 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyazawa in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,173,266 to Marx et al. (“Marx”) and U.S. Patent No. 5,577,165 to Takebayashi et al. (“Takebayashi”); rejected claims 4-5 and 16-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyazawa in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,185,527 to Petkovic et al. (“Petkovic”); rejected claims 6 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyazawa in view of Petkovic and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,505,162 to Wang et al. (“Wang”); rejected claims 7 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyazawa in view of Petkovic and further in view of Marx; rejected claims 8, 12, 20, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyazawa in view of Petkovic and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,236,968 to Kanevsky et al. (“Kanevsky”); rejected claims 10 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyazawa in view of Petkovic and Kanevsky further in view of Wang; rejected claims 11 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyazawa in view of Petkovic and Kanevsky further in view of Marx; and allowed claims 2, 9, 14, and 21.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Office Action contains statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Customer No. 22,852  
Attorney Docket No. 06753.0385  
Application No. 09/697,146

In response to the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in claims 2, 9, 14, and 21 (Office Action, p. 19), Applicants have canceled claims 2, 9, 14, and 21, without prejudice or disclaimer of their subject matter, and amended independent claims 1, 3, 4, and 25 to include the subject matter of claim 2, independent claim 8 to include the subject matter of claim 9, independent claims 13, 15, and 16 to include the subject matter of claim 14, and independent claim 20 to include the subject matter of claim 21. Since the Examiner indicated that claims 2, 9, 14, and 21 "would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims" (Office Action, p. 19), Applicants submit these amendments render the application in condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: June 27, 2006

By: /David W. Hill/  
David W. Hill  
Reg. No. 28,220